INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE

APPLICANT	:	AGENCY FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH
TITLE OF INVENTION	:	LOCATING A MID-SAGITTAL PLANE
INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION NO.	:	PCT/SG2005/000106
INTERNATIONAL FILING DATE	:	01 APRIL 2005
PRIORITY DATE	:	02 APRIL 2004
EXAMINER	:	ROBERT BARTRAM
ATTORNEY REFERENCE NO.	:	AY/YF/an/2005.1846

Australian Patent Office
PO BOX 200
WODEN ACT
2606
AUSTRALIA

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN OPINION

Dear Sir:

In response to the Written Opinion dated 16 February 2006, please consider the following.

REMARKS:

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 1-10 and 14-29 are considered to be novel, to include an inventive step and to have industrial applicability. Additionally, the Examiner has indicated that claims 11-13 have industrial applicability. However, the Examiner has indicated that claims 11-13 lack both novelty and inventive step in view of WO 2003/060827 A1, named "reference (c)" by the Examiner.

Claims 11-13 relate to finding an optimized mid-sagittal plane. More particularly, claim 11 relates to "obtaining said brain volume data in the form of a plurality of slices", "generally oriented parallel to a sagittal plane", "determining a measure for each slice

May 16, 2006

..." and "selecting a candidate mid-sagittal slice among said plurality of slices ..."
[EMPHASIS ADDED]

The Examiner has specifically referenced page 9, lines 16-19 in reference (c) to indicate that sagittal slices have been considered for use in the method described in reference (c). However, upon careful review of reference (c) it is apparent that the method described for locating a mid-sagittal plane involves approximating a fissure line segment in each of a plurality of slices. These fissure line segments are then used in calculating a plane equation for the mid-sagittal plane. [See, for example reference (c) page 9, lines 11-15]. Thus, reference (c) does not suggest or disclose selecting a candidate mid-sagittal slice form among a plurality of obtained slices, as required by claim 11.

Furthermore, it is submitted that the method described in reference (c) would not function correctly if axially-oriented or coronally-oriented slices were not used, since a fissure would be absent from the slices and, as such, it would be difficult to estimate fissure line segments properly.

In view of the above arguments, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 meets the PCT requirements for novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12 and 13, which are dependent upon claim 11, also meet the PCT requirements for novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability.

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner make a finding of novelty and inventive step with regard to claims 11-13.

Yours very truly,

Audrey Yap/ Yvette Flanigan
For: AGENCY FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH